DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 456 FL 016 755

AUTHOR Beardsmore, Hugo Baetens
TITLE Macrological and Micrological Problems in the Study of Multilingual and Multicultural Education.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 17p.; In: Blanc, Michel, Ed.; Hamers, Josiane F., Ed. Theoretical and Methodological Issues in the Study of Languages/Dialects in Contact at Macro- and Micro-Logical Levels of Analysis; see FL 016 743.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Coordination; *Educational Research; Interdisciplinary Approach; Interprofessional Relationship; Language Research; *Multicultural Education; *Multilingualism; *Research Methodology; *Research Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Language Contact

ABSTRACT

Five concepts are included in the title of this paper; they gravitate around the key words: problems, macrological, micrological, multilingual, and multicultural. In turn, these five sub-components of the study of multilingualism illustrate the fragmentation of research in this area. Problems are created by researchers who are unable to grasp the many dimensions of multilingualism. In the present state of knowledge, micrological approaches are considered more useful than larger-scale approaches for explaining the comparable or contradictory results of multilingual education. At the same time, macro-level investigations have provided theoretical insights into successful versus inadequate education. Multilingualism and multiculturalism have not yet even been satisfactorily defined. This fragmentation can only be overcome if the researchers involved attempt to coordinate their efforts so as to incorporate both macro- and micro-level research into an overall approach that extends the language and cultural elements across the curriculum and outside the classroom. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED282456

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A Prujiner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MACROLOGICAL AND MICROLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE STUDY OF MULTILINGUAL AND MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Hugo Baetens Beardsmore
Vrije Universiteit Brussel

Résumé / Abstract

Les cinq termes clés du titre de cet article sont passés en revue en soulignant le manque de cohésion entre chaque concept dans la recherche contemporaine sur l'éducation multilingue. La notion de problèmes est prise en considération par une approche qui démontre que si ceux-ci persistent, leur cause se situe chez les spécialistes, lesquels ont des difficultés à dominer la nature interdisciplinaire de l'objet d'étude; par contre, le multilinguisme lui-même ne doit pas être abordé comme un problème en soi, mais plutôt comme un composant normal du potentiel éducatif. Dans l'état actuel des connaissances, les approches micrologiques sont considérées comme plus aptes à expliquer les résultats comparables ou contradictoires des effets de l'éducation multilingue, plutôt que les approches à grande échelle. Un aperçu est donné des recherches en cours à l'Ecole Européenne de Bruxelles, lesquelles sont basées sur le modèle d'acculturation comme moyen de réconcilier les approches micrologiques et macrologiques. La notion d'éducation multilingue est mise en doute, tandis qu'une critique de l'élément culturel de cette éducation démontre que le seul moyen de l'obtenir serait de dépasser le cadre limite du cours de langues afin de l'intégrer dans le programme entier.

The topic we have been asked to address ourselves to contains five clear sub-components, each of which is potentially so vast that, in the framework allotted, it is impossible to go beyond a cursory examination. Moreover, to link these sub-components can only be attempted by some arbitrary method of approach. The following treatment represents some personal reflections on multilingual education based on the hazard of observation of a restricted number of situations.

The five sub-components gravitate around the key terms problems, macrological, micrological, multilingual and multicultural which I will arbitrarily coordinate by means of a further concept, that of fragmentation, by which I refer to the state of the art. I shall also, of necessity, consider the prefixes multi- in two of the sub-components as shorthand or bi- or multilingual and multicultural phenomena (unless clearly specified) given that many of the arguments will be based on research involving only two languages.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Prujiner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL016755

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

My starting point is to question the persistent and almost pernicious coupling of the connotation "problematic" to discussions on multilingualism as having a destructive ricochet effect on attempts to handle a form of education that should be the norm rather than the exception. For as long as we specialists continue to discuss multilingualism in education in the implicit judgemental fashion that so many non-specialists do, on a par with problems of illiteracy, school dropouts, drug-taking, or whatever, we are perhaps unwittingly compounding the negative aura that surrounds a phenomenon which is probably natural for a statistical majority of the world's population (LEWIS, 1976, 151; MACKEY, 1976, 13; OKSAAR, 1983).

Our approach should be similar to that of the provision of general education, numeracy and mathematical skills, literacy and social awareness, on the assumption that although some pupils may have problems in these areas they are nevertheless unquestioned as fundamental to education and consequently provided to the best of our intellectual and financial abilities. If we accept multilingualism as a normal component of human potential we can then appraise it in a way similar to that of literacy and numeracy where different levels of proficiency will be met with but where basic skills are provided for all. For the question seems to be, "Who's afraid of bilingualism?" to which the reply might well be, "The articulate, white monoglot" with an entrenched fear, based largely on anecdotal or emotional reactions, of losing out to those who have an extra skill that may or may not be marketable.

If problems there are they lie with us researchers who are unable to grasp the many dimensions of multilingualism in our present state of knowledge, unable to fit our fragmentary knowledge into coordinated and accepted frames of reference that link up pure linguistics, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, pedagogics and politicolinguistics, and unable to get what we do know across to the vast majority of monoglots behind the policy makers. The result is a weakening of our research impact which is polarized between the success stories of elite bilingualism (FISHMAN, 1976; BAETENS BEARDSMORE, 1979, 1980; SWAIN and LAPKIN, 1982; Language and Society, 1984; BAETENS BEARDSMORE and SWAIN, 1985) and the depressing polemicized debate around migrant education as illustrated by SKUTNABB-KANGAS and TOUKOMAA, 1976; EKSTRAND, 1979; PAULSTON, 1982 (to name but a few).

This fragmented thrust of research concerns often leads those focussing on migrant education to ignore the findings of successful elite programmes as irrelevant to the social and pedagogic needs of underprivileged groups. Instead, multilingual education provision should be seen as representing a continuum where the success and failure rates might possibly be interpreted as a reflection of general education provision, and indeed this is what CUMMINS (1984a) convincingly sets out to do. From this perspective one can highlight the inconsistency behind the fragmented approaches to language provision in the curriculum at present.

Most societies consider foreign language provision as an asset on the curriculum but teach languages so that they can hardly be learnt (through lack of time), let alone used. The immersion experience for majority groups has revealed that languages can be taught so that they will be used. Migrant education often falls between the two by teaching the majority language in a bilingual exit programme so that the minority language will disappear. The only serious accounts of this polarisation have been produced by CUMMINS (1981; 1984) whose general approach I consider as macrological.

CUMMINS' theoretical work begets the question as to how one can apply macrolevel considerations in the light of the widely diverging models of bilingual provision across the world and couple these to the multidisciplinary facets of successful acquisition alluded to earlier. For the macrolevel highlights widespread sociocultural norms and expectations (FISHMAN, 1972) and is synthetic in nature, yet from the literature it seems to restrict itself to broad accounts of multilingual provision while often neglecting the reality of the outcome, namely, how bilingual are the recipients at the end of the process? Even the highly reputable, longitudinal Canadian immersion research falls into this category, since the solid, data-based results provided tend to discuss broad levels of achievement, primarily in terms of receptive skills, with little mention of differentiated productive skills or how well the recipients reflect a range of ability in actually producing the second language. Given that unilingals from any school system reflect this broad range one would expect bilingual products of immersion programmes to be similar while still having gained an adequate mastery of the second language.

In the field of multilingual education several scholars have attempted to produce macrolevel frames of analysis, most of which are extremely difficult to apply with any consistency. FISHMAN (1976) distinguishes between three major types of bilingual education in terms of the goals or "sociocultural expectations", namely <u>transitional</u>, <u>enrichment</u> and <u>maintenance</u> programmes, with further refinements to these major categories. Yet when one examines the actual provision these distinctions often serve little purpose. Enrichment programmes of the immersion type are also maintenance programmes since the ultimate goal is to prevent language shift; maintenance programmes as offered by many international schools often contain an enrichment element; transitional programmes designed to promote shift to the majority language may or may not be enrichment programmes depending on the degree of abandonment of the L1 under the effects of subtractive bilingualism and the quality of achievement in L2. The table in BAETENS BEARDSMORE (1980) on the linguistic goals of the multilingual schools he investigated clearly brings this mixed perspective to the fore. Moreover, whatever the primary goals may be, transitional, enrichment or maintenance programmes generally lead to one language becoming dominant, though not necessarily the same for all the types of population. Although such classifications help to perceive major goals they in no way clarify practical distinctions in outcome, specifically, individual differentiation in bilingual

competence or a par with individual differentiation in other school subjects, including the L1.

A more controversial macrolevel analysis is that produced by SKUTNABB-KANGAS (1984, 125ff & 237ff) in which she links up the language of instruction with what she sees as the major societal goals of a particular programme. The refinement here is that enrichment programmes may become assimilaroty for minority groups or may lead to language maintenance for both minorities and majorities depending on the strategies employed; that immersion enrichment programmes for majorities may lead to transitional submersion cases for minorities; that what is additive for majorities may become subtractive for minorities; and that the consequences may be positive for majorities and negative for minorities.

What such generalizations fail to bring out is the case of the "poor little rich kid" in the elite programmes who does not develop highly proficient bilingual skills or the "good little migrant" who does develop bilingualism. Yet such cases have informally been brought to my attention in my investigation of schools though to my knowledge there is sparse mention of these examples in the literature, let alone any account of these exceptions. As COOPER (1983, 60) has state:

> "The advantage of the summative approach is that it can deal with notions of great generality and scope. Its disadvantage is that it tends to be removed from the data of direct experience".

Other attempts at macrolevel analysis lead to similar questions. SPOLSKY, GREEN and READ (1976) provide an ambitious model for analysis on this scale, in the form of three hexagonal figures which attempt to reflect the interaction of situational, operational and outcome levels of multilingual education in terms of linguistic, psychological, sociological, economic, religio-cultural and political parameters. In the final analysis, however, all such models provide is a framework for a broad descriptive comparison between different schooling systems, giving fewer theoretical insights into success or failure than does CUMMINS (1981; 1984a) and still less explanation of differentiated outcome within any one given situation. MILAN (1982) has produced a "Generative Analysis of the Constituent Dimension of Bilingual Education" in which he examines the following parameters: attitudes towards bilingualism, attitudes towards the languages in question, schools systems' position towards dominance in a marked language, determination of the bilingual education clientele, amount of community participation in the formulation of the bilingual curriculum, manner in which community input is delivered. However, all these examples bring us full circle back to MACKEY's (1972) contention that due to the various combination of factors present any single definition of bilingual schooling would be either too wide or too narrow to be of any use in planning or research, for what is true of one combination of factors is untrue for another.

An alternative approach is to examine large-scale, societally determined endeavours in terms of the end-product or "widespread cultural norms and expectations" in which case the obvious model is the solid, longitudinally based Canadian experience with various types of immersion programmes. This successful phenomenon, amply substantiated in the literature, has led to a publication destined for the United States, Studies on Immersion Education: A Collection for United States Educators (1984) which reports on and warns against attempts to apply a model from one context (Canada) to a different sociolinguistic and sociopolitical environment, the U.S.A. In other words, the Canadian model should not be considered as for export in a simplistic way, as indicated by HERNANDEZ-CHAVEZ in the volume in question since the Canadian "norms and expectations" are totally different from those prevalent in the United States. It would be totally wrong to assume that Canadian models can be transposed without modification to other countries and indeed it is possible that the success of the Canadian experience might impede the development of indigenous solutions to different societally determined multilingual education requirements. CUMMINS (1984a) repeatedly warns of this danger. Consequently, it is doubtful whether any macrolevel analysis is for export, except in the very broadest terms of reference.

Nevertheless, the theoretical insights gleaned from macro-level investigations do provide a means of analysing successful versus inadequate provision in broad terms, as CUMMINS (1981; 1984a; 1984b) does. These analyses help to account for the polarized success rates by means of the notions of context-embedded and context-reduced communication, linked up with cognitively demanding versus cognitively undemanding linguistic activities and related to the theory of a common underlying linguistic proficiency which determines the success of bilingual achievement in terms of length of contact with two languages. CUMMINS (1981, 4) also points out that

> "the sociocultural determinants of minority students' school failure ... are more fundamental than linguistic factors"

by which he could be referring to both macro and micro features but where the analyses and arguments are macro-determined.

An examination of the macrolevel literature reveals that sociocultural determinants tends to refer to things like amount of input, length of residence, programme structure, ethnic, status and class features, attitudinal patterns, global test scores and the general insertion of a given programme in a particular social context. An alternative macrolevel analysis that attempts to explain differentiated linguistic and academic success within minority communities is OGBU's (1978) distinction between "caste, immigrant and autonomous" minorities which reflects differentiated scholastic success patterns among blacks, Hispanics and Asian immigrants in the United Stated. Here again it is felt that this analysis goes little futher than describing given facts with no solutions as to how to overcome problems, unless one follows an absurd implication (not suggested

by OGBU, of course) that Hispanics should adopt the cultural dispositions of Asians. Moreover, the general approach to bilingual education in the United States is self-defeating in that it is designed towards rapid exit from a special programme and transition to monoglot education, thereby concentrating on how to make the bilingual (?) as monoglot as possible within the shortest time span, cf. CUMMINS (1984a, 265)

> "... the bilingual experience in the United States hardly represents a model of rational language planning".

One of the few attempts at discrete macrolevel comparisons between differing multilingual education provision in widely diverging contexts is that carried out by BAETENS BEARDSMORE and SWAIN (1985). This study compares achievement in second language acquisition in Canadian immersion programmes, designed primarily for language enrichment, and European School bilingual education, designed primarily for language maintenance, where both promote French as a second language. Using Canadian designed standardized test materials it was found that 13+ year olds in Canada who had received approximately 4,500 hours of French obtained similar test scores to European School 13+ year olds who had received approximately 1,300 hours in-class French and that this similarity could not be explained in terms of programme design, class status, ethnic background, length of residence, or any of the more evident features that come to the fore in macrolevel investigations. It is only in terms of speculation on what could be classified as microlevel approaches that one can explain the similarities of results across the two populations.

FISHMAN (1972) maintains that the microlevel deals with individual behaviour at the level of face-to-face verbal encounters, while MILROY (1983, 103) points out that

> "... people interact meaningfully as individuals (at the microlevel) <u>in addition to</u> forming parts of structured functional institutions such as classes, castes, or occupational groups (at the macrolevel)."

Moreover, BREITBORDE (1983, 175) argues that

> "... much of what occurs at the microlevel is based on macrolevel features, and ... the social system and its structure are crucial aspects of the macrolevel which enter into the definitions of interactions and people's use of language in them".

BEATENS BEARDSMORE and SWAIN's attempt to account for the comparable test scores takes the above positions into account, though without any detailed evidence. From the questionnaire used with the Canadian and European populations it was clear that pupils' self-motivated use of French and the opportunity to use this language outside the classroom was high for the Europeans and low for the Canadians. Apart

from at home and with relatives, French tends to be used at least sometimes and often more with friends outside school, between classes and at lunch, and out in the community by the Europeans, whereas immersion children report little self-initiated use of French. In the European School French has an immediate pertinence beyond the purely classroom requirement, whereas in immersion contexts French is not often used in the environment outside the classroom, is not used for inter-pupil contacts in playground communication, is not part of a multilingual setting which makes it a normal component of other than classroom experience. SWAIN (1983) further points out the significance of the microlevel element when she looks at the relationship between input and output in achievement levels by stating that it is not input per se (or classroom controlled features) that is important to second language acquisition, but input that occurs in interaction where meaning is negotiated. It seems that in the context of the European School the negotiating of meaning outside the formal context of the classroom plays an important role in accounting for the similar test score results to those achieved by immersion children.

A modest attempt is at present under way to test the microlevel features that seem to play such an important role in the European School context, on the assumption that in the field of bilingual education, and largely thanks to the Canadian research, macrolevel investigations might well have reached the extent of their limitations. But here the question arises as to what sort of model we can turn to that can best incorporate the ideas put forward by MILROY and BREITBORDE alluded to earlier. Here I would cautiously put forward two approaches, the first of which is at present being tried out in the European School.

SCHUMANN (1978a; 1978b) developed his acculturation model of second language acquisition specifically to account for acquisition under conditions of immigration and lengthy residence in a second language environment without any language instruction. This model is based on the social psychology of acculturation and interconnects social factors and attitudinal dispositions, though it does not, obviously, take classroom instruction into account. In the present European School investigation we are trying to build up from the macrolevel comparison produced by BAETENS BEARDSMORE and SWAIN by incorporating those elements of SCHUMANN's model that seem pertinent to the task, in order to tap the interactional elements which may account for the level of achievement in French by the pupils concerned. To do so, a small number of pupils are being investigated, some of whom have French as L2, others French as their L3 (and either German or English as L2), in a pilot study to discover means of operationalizing SCHUMANN's model and hopefully correlating it with differentiated linguistic ability as revealed by global test measures.

SCHUMANN posited the broad concepts of social distance and psychological distance as primary determinants in the relationship between acculturation and bilingual attainment. Under social distance he refers to several factors which affect the nature and amount of

contact speakers of one language may have with those of another, thereby influencing the amount of input provided. The assumption is that the greater the social distance between the two groups of speakers the more difficult it is for either or both of them to become bilingual. This is assessed by looking at the following:

- social dominance patterns where a politically, culturally, or economically superior group tends not to acquire the language of the inferior group, as for example when colonizing forces fail to learn the languages of the conquered territories. On the other hand the subordinate group may resist learning the language of the dominant group, e.g. certain American Indians;
- levels of assimilation, preservation or adaptation which determine whether speakers of language A give up their specific life style and values (assimilation), maintain these (preservation), thereby affecting the nature and quality of contacts with speakers of language B, or adapt to the life style and values of language B group while maintaining those of language A for intra-group contacts. This factor is significant in analyzing inter-generational differences in bilingual proficiency in immigrant communities whereby the first generation is the least assimilated, the second often adaptive and the third frequently assimilated and tending towards unilingualism in the majority language;
- degree of enclosure which refers to the sharing or separate use of such institutions as churches, schools, recreation facilities, etc. The more these are shared the lower the degree of enclosure and the greater the possibility of cross-lingual contacts;
- cohesiveness and size of the language group which determine the amount of contact between speakers of different languages, the more cohesive and the larger a group is the less likely it will need to seek out opportunities to use another language;
- congruence or similarity of the two cultures in presence, greater similarity making language learning potentially easier to accomplish even though it might not do so in fact;
- attitudes towards the other community, positive attitudes increasing the likelihood of language acquisition, negative attitudes decreasing it;
- intended length of residence where a lengthy stay is likely to promote more contacts with the other group, and more linguistic interaction than a short stay (SCHUMANN, 1978a, 29-31; 1978b, 77-86).

Under psychological distance SCHUMANN gives a series of subcomponents of which the three most important in our eyes are as follows (for others, cf. SCHUMANN, 1978a, 31-34; 1978b, 86-99):

- culture shock relating to the ease or difficulty with which the cultural attributes borne by the second language and its speakers are assimilated. In situations where the new environment creates disorientation and stress it can lead to rejection of the new community and a minimizing of efforts to acquire its language;

- ego-permeability which refers to the amount of inhibition felt in using a weaker language, the more permeable one is the more likely one is to take risks in trying out the weaker language;
- motivation, whether this is integrative or instrumental, determining the path one takes in pursuing bilingualism.

Now it is highly likely that the above sub-components of social and psychological distance interact in different degrees and that in applying them to specific circumstances the different elements have to be weighted some way. However, it is also highly plausible that the sub-components represent a chain of causality whereby acculturation increases contacts with speakers of the second language leading to greater verbal interaction and enhanced potential for acquisition. What is interesting in this model is that it has the potential for incorporating different and sometimes conflicting individual achievements into more global group patternings in a consistent, and therefore comparable, frame of reference. That is, it should be able to explain why certain individuals from a particular group have problems with bilingual and bicultural proficiency whereas others from the same group do not. By the same token it should allow for comparison of group trends in widely diverging circumstances, through the weighting of each sub-component.

At this stage of our investigation it is not certain what the outcome in the Brussels European School will be, but it appears likely that we will have a clearer account for the comparability of the immersion and European School results than by simply looking at macro-level models.

A second approach that might well be worth taking up is that put forward by ATTINASI, PEDRAZA, POPLACK and POUSADA (1982), synthetically summarized in POPLACK (1983), which looked into intergenerational perspectives on bilingualism by integrating community and classroom data among Hispanics in New York and then going in for careful microlevel investigations. ATTINASI et al. (1982, 5) take up the position that

> "... any analyses that do not extend beyond the walls of the classroom are doomed to inadequacy. Without an understanding of community norms and assumptions that underlie children's school behaviour, or knowledge about their behaviour outside of school, there can be no complete appreciation of their classroom activity".

What these studies stress is the need for long-term participant observation as part of an interdisciplinary approach to resolving problems in the study of bilingual education and their findings have refined or overturned many generalizations previously hypothesized as more or less universal, e.g. clear-cut compartmentalization for the maintenance of diglossia, differences and similarities between observed and reported language use; code-switching as a reflection of linguistic inadequacies, all of which proved to be the opposite of what had previously been assumed by scholars.

Within the framework of the present paper a question needs to be raised about the concept of multilingual education, namely what do we mean? If we are referring only to the presence of a multilingual population in a given school, then the reality shows us (cf. BAETENS BEARDSMORE, 1979; 1980) that most establishments providing for these pupils are at best only producing bilinguals and that in fact we should talk about multilingual populations in bilingual education. Apart from the European School system almost no network I know of, be it the so-called International Schools (many of which are basically monolingual in curricular structure anyway) or different types of experimental schools, provide multilingual education. The European School network, on the other hand, does work up to a trilingual system for all in secondary education, with a variety of options open for selection. Almost no investigations have been carried out on the results of this trilingual programme, though we are working on this at present. Personal communications from staff at the school indicate that levels of achievement in L3 do not match up to expectations, in spite of many favourable circumstances. For example, a pupil of Dutch origin, with Dutch as L1 in the school, may select English as L2 and achieve satisfactory bilingual competence over time. If this pupil also selects French as L3 in secondary education it seems that he soon attains a plateau of ability beyond which little progress seems to be made, in spite of the fact that French is the lingua franca of the school under investigation and that it is omni-present in the out-of-school environment.

If the teachers' reports prove to be founded then this has implications of a theoretical nature that need clarifying. For if CUMMINS' interdevelopmental and threshold level hypotheses are correct for explaining the relationship between L1 and L2 in scholastic achievement, then by the same token they should explain a similar relationship when L3 is introduced. As yet we do not know whether this is the case, but assuming the teachers are right then what happens when L3 is added? Does L3 get downgraded in the eyes of the pupils to the role of just another subject on the curriculum that might or might not be worth the effort to do well? does the presence of two languages enhance of inhibit the progression of the third? Until we look into this type of situation we have nothing to say about the widespread assumption that being bilingual leads to the rapid acquisition of other languages or about the belief that multilingualism is essentially similar to bilingualism.

The final element in our title, the multicultural element, is the most difficult to handle. The first difficulty lies with the definition of culture at the outset, and I have no intention of attempting what more specialized scholars have failed to achieve before me. Since we have no satisfactory conceptualization of what constitutes culture, as opposed to language, in a given society, I feel incapable of saying very much constructive about multiculturalism in education. Many scholastic programmes pay lipservice to multicultural awareness but when one looks at what goes on one sees nothing more than a shattering fragmentation of well-intentioned

attempts to offer bits of culture that will hopefully fall into place in the sociolinguistic behaviour of the learner.

Schools I have observed in Birmingham, England, serving multi-ethnic populations without providing multilingualism paid lip-service to the cultural background of their pupils by selecting story materials from West Africa or India about snakes and huts which appeared to serve little purpose except salve consciences and provide an exotic story line to a learning task. In the United States frequent reference is made to different classroom behaviour to be expected according to culture of origin, e.g. eye-contact rules, turn-taking and deference rules, though none of this seems to be more than scratching at the surface of multicultural awareness. And the main question is, how much culture can be supplied as a discrete element of a multilingual programme when one bears in mind the time constraints imposed by the academic learning task in the curriculum? Only incidentally can cultural components be touched upon, dependent on a purely haphazard selection of what the teacher feels keen on, such as folklore, literary excerpts highlighting an intriguing cultural phenomenon, historical background information of the type provided in what the Germans call "Landeskunde" and the British "Institutions", or discrete cultural phenomena of the type pointed out by GODARD (1977) in his comparison of telephone gambits in the United States and France.

DESHAIES (this volume) points to the tensions between real interaction by individuals and their membership of a particular social class (or cultural group) and the opinions she expresses with reference to linguistic variation could apply equally to multicultural concerns, namely,

> "Analyser les variations ... implique que le chercheur doive d'abord partir des individus, de la diversité de leur expérience sociale, des tensions et des enjeux que celle-ci représente pour eux, ainsi que des conflits, des contradictions, des ajustements constants que celle-ci provoque".

From the linguist's point of view it is felt that the only pertinent way of integrating the language and cultural elements of a programme is to consistently supply the linguistic element via a thorough application of the theory of communicative competence developed by HYMES (1972). For this is the only theory that can achieve this goal since it involves the influence of both human biological make-up and culturally acquired knowledge in the determination of the structure of the language. The theory, then, is a combination of linguistic and social knowledge, or, to communicate in a socially appropriate fashion one must incorporate the cultural rules borne by the language (PHILIPS, 1983). Hence, if one were teaching the pronoun system it would presumably be pertinent to incorporate the ideas of the pronouns of power and solidarity (BROWN and GILMAN, 1970), as well as their displacement equivalents, like modes of address,

formality markers, etc. Other examples of this type could be found for the purely language component of the curriculum but would still probably be inadequate.

DESHAIES (this volume) states that "Parler de société, comme parler de langage, c'est déjà parler d'histoire" which could be paraphrased into "talking about culture, like talking about language, is really talking about history". Given the time constraints on the curriculum it is highly likely that the cultural component needs to go beyond the language class and into other subjects preferably also taught in the second language and based on approaches which are definitely not monocultural. European Schools and certain international schools could serve as models here. In the European School network geography is taught to all pupils in a second language, with atlases, for example, giving place names in the language of the region they designate rather than in translation. History, also taught in the second language, incorporates both national and European history in an integrated framework which smoothes out national bias. The International School of Washington also teaches history via the second language using specifically designed materials that provide a multinational dimension to the background to culture (cf. GOODMAN and SCOTT, 1980). These examples serve as indicators as to how the multicultural dimension of language learning can be extended from the fragmentary approach which is inherent to the constraints of the classroom.

To conclude, it is felt that the fragmentation that has bedeviled progress in multilingual and multicultural education provision can only be overcome if the researchers involved attempt to coordinate their thrust so as to incorporate both macro- and microlevel research into an overall educative approach which extends the language and cultural elements across the curriculum and outside the classroom. By so doing we may hope to replace the problems by the more neutral concerns of questions and issues.

REFERENCES

ATTINASI, J., PEDRAZA, P., POPLACK, S. and POUSADA, A. (1982), *Intergenerational Perspectives on Bilingualism: from Community to Classroom.* New York, Center for Puerto Rican Studies.

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, H. (1979), "Bilingual Education for Highly Mobile Children", In: *Language Planning and Language Problems*, 3, 3 (9), 138-155.

—— (1980), "Bilingual Education in International Schools, European Schools and Experimental Schools: A Comparative Analysis", In: Lim Kiat Boey (ed.), *Bilingual Education.* Singapore, Singapore University Press, 3-19.

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, H. and SWAIN, M. (1985), "Designing Bilingual Education: Aspects of Immersion and 'European School' Models", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6, 1, 1-15.

BREITBORDE, L. (1983), "Levels of Analysis in Sociolinguistic Explanation: Bilingual Code Switching, Social Relations and Domain Theory", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 39, 5-43, 161-177.

BROWN, R. AND GILMAN, A. (1970), "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity", In Fishman, J.A. (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague, Mouton, 252-275.

COOPER, R. (1983), "Comment on Breitborde, L. Levels of Analysis in sociolinguistic Explanation: Code Switching, Social Relations, and Domain Theory", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 39.

CUMMINS, J. (1981), "The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students", In: *Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework.* Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, Los Angeles, 3-49.

—— (1984a), *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy.* Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

—— (1984b) "Wanted: A Theoretical Framework for Relating Language Proficiency to Academic Achievement Among Bilingual Students", In Rivera, C. (ed.), *Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement.* Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 2-19.

DESHAIES, D. (1986 - this volume), *Quelques réflexions sur la variation linguistique.*

EKSTRAND, L. (1979), *Replacing the Critical Age Period and Optimum Age Theories of Second Language Acquisition with a Theory of Ontogenetic Development Beyond Puberty*. Lund, Malmö School of Education.

FISHMAN, J. (1972), "Domains and the Relationship Between Micro- and Macrosociolinguistics", In: Gumperz, J. and Hymes, D. (eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 435-453.

—— (1976), *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective*. Rowley, Newbury House.

GODARD, P. (1977), "Same Setting, Different Norms: Phone Call Beginnings in France and the United States", In: *Language in Society*, 6, 209-219.

GOODMAN, D. and SCOTT, G. (1980), "The International High School: A Challenge for Scholars", In: *ACTFUL, Action for the Eighties*, Skokie, Ill., National Textbook Co., 147-178.

HERNANDEZ-CHAVEZ, E. (1984), "The Inadequacy of English Immersion Education as an Educational Approach for Language Minority Students in the United States", In: *Studies on Immersion Education: A Collection for United States Educators*. Sacramento, California State Department of Education, 144-183.

HYMES, D. (1972), "On Communicative Competence", In: Pride, J. and Holmes, J. (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 269-293.

LANGUAGE AND SOCIETY (1984), Special Issue: "The Immersion Phenomenon", vol. 12.

LEWIS, E.G. (1976), "Bilingualism and Bilingual Education: The Ancient World to the Renaissance", In: Fishman, J., *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective*. Rowley, Newbury House, 150-201.

MACKEY, W. (1972), "A Typology of Bilingual Education", In: Fishman, J. (ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language*. The Hague, Mouton, vol. II, 413-432.

—— (1976), *Bilinguisme et contact des langues*. Paris, Klincksiek.

MILAN, W. (1982), "A Generative Analysis of the Constituent Dimensions of Bilingual Education", In: Fishman, J. and Keller, G. (eds.), *Bilingual Education for Hispanic Students in the United States*. New York, Teacher's College Columbia University, 91-135.

MILROY, L. (1983), "Comment on Breitborde, L. Levels of Analysis in Sociolinguistic Explanation: Bilingual Code Switching, Social Relations and Domain Theory", In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 39.

OGBU, J. (1978), *Minority Education and Caste*. New York, Academic Press.

OKSAAR, E. (1983), "Multilingualism and Multiculturalism from the Linguist's Point of View", In: Husen, T. and Opper, S. (eds.), *Multilingual and Multicultural Education in Immigrant Countries*. Oxford, Pergamon, 17-36.

PAULSTON, C.B. (1982), *Swedish Research and Debate about Bilingualism*. Skolöverstyrelsen, National Swedish Board of Education.

PHILIPS, S. (1983), "An Ethnographic Approach to Bilingual Language Proficiency", In: Rivera, C. (ed.), *An Ethnographic/Sociolinguistic Approach to Language Proficiency Assessment*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 88-106.

POPLACK, S. (1983), "Intergenerational Variation in Language Use and Structures in a Bilingual Context", In: Rivera, C. (ed.), *An Ethnographic/Sociolinguistic Approach to Language Proficiency Assessment*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 42-70.

SCHUMANN, J. (1978a), "The Acculturation Model for Second Language Acquisition", In: Gingras, R. (ed.), *Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching*. Arlington, Center for Applied Linguistics, 27-50.

—— (1978b), *The Pidginization Process: A Model for Second Language Acquisition*. Rowley, Newbury House.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, T. and TOUKOMAA, P. (1976), *Teaching Migrant Children's Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in the Context of the Socio-cultural Situation of the Migrant Family*. Tampere, University of Tampere, Dept. of Sociology and Social Psychology.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, T. (1984), *Bilingualism or Not: The Education of Minorities*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

SPOLSKY, B., GREEN, J. and READ, J. (1976), "A Model for the Description, Analysis and Perhaps Evaluation of Bilingual Education", In: Verdoodt, A. and Kjolseth, R. (eds.), *Language in Sociology*, Louvain, Peeters, 233-263.

STUDIES IN IMMERSION EDUCATION: *A Collection for United States Educators*. (1984), Sacramento, California State Department of Education.

SWAIN, M. and LAPKIN, S. (1982), *Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.

SWAIN, M. (1983), "Communicative Competence: Some Role of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in its Development", Paper presented at the Xth University of Michigan Conference on Applied Linguistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Oct. 28-30.